



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

māldt, not *mālath*, which every Semitic student would consider as equivalent to מַלֵּךְ ('to save'; but here again I must say that this is the meaning of the Piel, while the Qal means 'to escape.' For the correct etymology of ἀνδράποδον I refer Keller and his readers to Lagarde's *Baktrische Lexicographie*, 23, rem. 1. Not only is *Pelagos* derived from Hebrew פֶּלֶג 'canal,' Middle High German *bulge* being completely ignored; *Persephone* from פֶּרִי־צֶפֶן (!) 'the fruit of the hidden,' i. e. 'Frucht des im Boden verborgen gewesenen Samenkorns,' but also *Heracles* from the Hebrew רָבַל 'to go around and about'—article *ha*. Truly, one is reminded of the early days of Assyriology when H. Fox Talbot (*Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* II 33) derived Διόνυσος from the Assyrian *dān nīše* 'judge of the nations,' an epithet of the Sun-god Šamaš, pronounced by him *diyān nise*, or Hades (ib., p. 188), from *Bit Edī* or *Bit Hadi*; but there is no such word in Assyrian; the ideographic expression being KUR NU-GI-A = *erṣit lā tārat* 'the land whence no return.'

I have only touched on a few points in the second part of Keller's book, a thorough criticism of which would fill a volume of about the same size as the book itself. To this part I shall return again in a special treatise on 'Semitic words in the Greek and Latin languages,' to be published in vol. XXIII of the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

Kleine Schriften von Heinrich Ludolf Ahrens: erster Band. Zur Sprachwissenschaft, besorgt von CARL HAEBERLIN, mit einem Vorwort von O. CRUSIUS. Hannover, Hahn'sche Buchhandlung, 1891. xv, 584. Price 16 Marks.

In these latter days, when the ancient reign of the classics is molested on every hand, it may seem a hazardous thing to adventure a volume of collected essays dating in part from the first half of the century. Greek has been voted a protected commodity by the Senate of the University of Cambridge, one of whose sons has taken up arms, whetted by his study of Aristotle, against the further supremacy of the language of the philosopher; in America, as we all know, we have our own battle to fight; and even in Germany we hear regrets for the old times. The number of students of Greek and Latin at the gymnasia and the universities there has, if we are correctly informed, sensibly diminished within the past decade; and Caesar has now entered the lists against the dominion of the old-time studies. While the devoted adherents of Greek are convinced by the continual disclosure of new treasures of art and literature that they were never better fitted to understand and proclaim the lessons of the eternal Hellenic spirit, the world at large, it must be confessed, has grown somewhat impatient of the part Greek has played in our system of education.

In taking up this first selection of the works of Ahrens it seems as if his shade would not rest, but arose to ask of his few surviving contemporaries:

ὦ πιστὰ πιστῶν, ἡλίκες θ' ἤβης ἐμῆς,
Πέρσαι γεραιοί, τίνα πόλις πονεῖ πόνον;

Ahrens was not only a great investigator, he was a great teacher. No one but a great teacher could have infused vitality into his theory that instruction in Greek should begin with the beginnings of its literature, and that its study

should advance together with the development of the language until it reached the perfected form wrought by the master-workers of the Attic dialect. Ahrens was by inheritance a great teacher. He was the pupil of Otfried Müller, and at the Lyceum in Hanover he trained many pupils who have since won for themselves an honorable place in the history of classical philology. It is due to the loyalty of one of these pupils, Otto Crusius, now professor at Tübingen, that we are at last placed in a position to survey at least a part of the scientific activity of his master. We are also indebted to Dr. C. Haeberlin, to whom was entrusted the carrying out of Prof. Crusius' plan. Dr. Haeberlin has fulfilled his laborious task in a highly acceptable manner by verifying the references, infixing the pagination of the original publications and supplying convenient indices.

Ahrens was born early enough to have drawn his inspiration from the encyclopaedic instruction of the early leaders of philology, who were still under the influence of Wolf, early enough to have felt the stimulus of the first linguistic researches of Bopp; but at a time when he was freed from the temptation to divorce literature from language. To the end he was always pressing forward to keep pace with the investigations of younger generations of scholars. That he did not leave behind him a greater number of masterpieces is due in part to this restless activity, and in part to the requirements in the form of 'programmes' and addresses exacted of the practical school-teacher, the pathos of whose lot speaks out with such intensity in the recently published *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik* of Hatzidakis. Of the one hundred titles of Ahrens' works collected by Haeberlin, fully a fifth is the outcome of his practical duties as an educator of youth, which he remained to the last.

Of Ahrens' joint pursuit of the study of classical antiquity and of comparative philology, the chief result, beyond all question, was the *De Graecae linguae dialectis*, published only ten years after its author obtained his doctor's degree at Göttingen (1829) and in the year immediately following upon that which witnessed the appearance of the well-known tractate *Ueber die Conjugation auf μ im homerischen Dialekte*. It has been the singular fortune of the work on the Greek dialects that it held its ground uncontested by any rival for nearly forty years, despite, perhaps even because of the enormous increase of material illustrative of the subject. It is only recently that a part of the Dialects reappeared in a second edition under the care of Meister, to whom it was entrusted by its author shortly before his death; while no small part of the legacy of opportunity bequeathed by Ahrens to his successors still remains unclaimed. A comprehensive treatise on Ionic, a dialect of greater literary interest than Doric or Aiolic, which engaged Ahrens in the first two and only volumes of the Dialects, still does not exist. Of Ahrens' great work this is not the place to speak. It is one of those pioneering yet enduring works, one of those classical treatises in the history of philology which deserve, as Crusius well says, a place on the same shelf as Wolf's *Prolegomena* and Hermann's *Elementa*.

A striking feature of Ahrens' scientific activity is the emphasis he laid upon the study of the poetical monuments. Whether as an investigator of language or as a critical student of literature, he dealt with Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Epicharmus, Sophron, the melic and elegiac poets. The tragic poets were, it

is true, not a subject for special investigation with him. But Aeschylus he studied much, and besides the papers on the Agamemnon in the *Philologus* for 1860, he wrote reviews of Bamberger's *Choephoroe*, Schoemann's *Prometheus*, and Franz' *Oresteia*. Nor is there manifest any lack of interest in mythology. Yet there is scarcely a single product of his pen dealing with Greek prose literature as such. Had Ahrens embraced Ionic in his researches, we should doubtless have heard his views on the question of the origin of Attic prose. The Ionisms of tragedy and Thucydides, though few in number, must bring close home to every one the problem of the influence exerted by Ionic upon the rise of Attic as an organ of literature. Throughout his life, so long as he occupied himself with the dialects, Ahrens gave, almost of necessity, greater scope to Doric and Aeolic; and thus was easily led in time to that closer study of Theocritus which resulted in the edition of 1850 (of which there have been seven unchanged impressions) and in the larger work of 1855-59.

Next to the *Dialects*, Ahrens' *Theocritus* is the work by which he is best known and by which his fame is ensured. The *Theocritus* is still the most exhaustive critical edition that we possess. In it, as elsewhere, Ahrens exhibited that fine sense of proportion which recognized as a characteristic virtue of Greek literature the subtle interrelation between the literary dialect and the ordinary speech of the people. The imperishable treatise that has taught us more than any other single contribution to the subject—*Ueber die Mischung der Dialekte in der griechischen Lyrik*—showed us that it is art, not the casual affinities of the individual, which regulates the delicate shading of dialectal speech in Greek literature. Greek literature, in one point at least, is unlike other literatures. From Homer till the latest period in which the literary genius of the Greeks was creative, the dialects were more or less commingled in poetry. In fact there exists scarcely any branch of the poetic art which did not consciously intervein one dialect with another. Now it is not to the renown of Ahrens that he admitted the existence of dialect admixture (Hermann had long before him seen the facts and attempted a solution of their interrelation), but that he found the law of permanence of literary type as expressed in dialectal language, i. e. that the various branches of the poetic art did not abandon the dialect in which they started. That in the existing monuments this principle is everywhere carried out may perhaps be denied. Yet in its essential features it still holds good, despite the recent assaults upon it by Fick. Ahrens avoided the dangers on either hand. In the inscriptions, though they record the actual usage of the time and are free from the suspicion of corruption at the hands of blundering scribes or of sciolists, he refused to see an absolute standard to control MS tradition. Nor, on the other hand, did he fail to recognize the fact that without epigraphy palaeography may starve. Ahrens would have rejected Fick's theory of the absolute authoritativeness of purely inscriptional testimony; and wondered at the supersensitiveness of Fritzsche's musico-philological ear. Fritzsche thought that the minute shades of feeling expressed in Theocritus' use, now of an epic, now of a Doric or an Aiolic form, were to be apprehended only by the critic whose soul was attuned to this harmony of language, and in the same manner as it may apprehend the subtle variations in the last three measures of Beethoven's *Symphony in a dur*.

In the present volume there is a goodly number of epigraphical essays.

Most noteworthy is the well-known treatise on the Kyprian inscriptions, which still possesses a distinct value of its own. There are also commentaries on inscriptions from Olympia (Roehl 75, 112, 113), and a treatise on Lakonian. The dialect of the bucolic poets is represented only by the caustic review of Mühlmann's *Leges dialecti qua Graecorum poetae bucolici usi sunt*.

Ahrens was undoubtedly stronger on the side of systematic grammar than of etymology. To work in etymology before the last quarter of this century was often a difficult and a dangerous thing. Ahrens suffered shipwreck on the rock of proper names. The lengthy treatise *Ueber eine wichtige indogermanische Familie von Götternamen* can add nothing to his fame. The name of Poseidon has been discussed with better results by Pott and, in later times, by Prellwitz, than in the essay *Ueber den Namen des Poseidon*, though nowhere do we find a greater wealth of illustrative material. Other papers of an etymological character are: 'Pā, *Beitrag zur gr. Etymologie und Lexicographie*; *Αἰλή* und *Villa*; *Ein Beitrag zur Etymologie der gr. Zahlwörter*; *Etymologische Untersuchungen zum Homer* (1. ἀπανράω, ἐπανρίσκω, ἐρνῶ; 2. ῥύομαι, ἐρύομαι, εἰρύομαι, σός, οὔρος, ὦραι; 3. Einiges über die sogenannte Distraction; 4. εἶσαι, ἀμφιέλισσαι, ἔλικες); *Δρῦς* und seine Sippe.

For the history of language and the study of prehistoric civilization it is imperative that the choice and use of words to denominate parts of the body and other common things be followed through the various languages. Ahrens set the type for this species of investigation in the treatise published shortly before his death: *Die gr. und lat. Benennungen der Hand* (Teubner, 1879). This work was of too great an extent to be incorporated in this volume.

There can be no question that as a student of the formal side of grammar Ahrens must hold a very high place. It is astonishing how much is still correct in his *Conjugation in μ*: *im homerischen Dialekte*, dedicated to Otfried Müller in 1838. The *Formenlehre des homerischen und attischen Dialektes* is still serviceable, though the rapid advance of Homeric investigation along the lines laid down in part by Ahrens himself has rendered much out of date. Some time ago the reviewer was struck by the occurrence of ἦρα in Herodas. Lucius' recent treatise on *Crisis and Aphaeresis* contains nothing on the question, but Ahrens, *De Crasi*, p. 60, gave an explanation of the form, to which that of Brugmann has been forced to yield. In the treatise *On the Hand* before mentioned, Ahrens anticipated Wackernagel's explanation of the form *ἐαντόν* (K. Z. XXVII 279).

Of the grammatical treatises we may notice especially the Homeric excurses which deal i. a. with the gen. in -οο, the gemination of initial ν, *Τρῳαί, Τρῳάς, Τρῳός, Τρῳή*, the lengthening of short final syllables in the hexameter (four papers), and with certain legitimate species of hiatus. There is also a treatise on hiatus in the older elegiac poets. The discussion of the feminines in ω has not lost its interest, despite the more recent investigation of the question by Danielsson and Johannes Schmidt. Here, as always, Ahrens supports his view with a wealth of illustration from literature, the inscriptions, and the grammarians which he knew equally well with the Königsbergers. Ahrens' erudition was in fact rivalled only by that of Lobeck. No one who has not himself worked his way into the enormous mass of grammatical literature can fail to be amazed at Ahrens' unwearied patience, firm grasp, and critical insight.

It is needless to say that the treatises collected in this volume cannot claim the place they once enjoyed. *Dies diem docet*. We have learned that phonetic 'law' is more rigorous in its requirements than was imagined by the leaders of the past generation. The days of wonderment at the correlation of ordinary Greek and Latin forms has long gone by. But whatever the errors of Ahrens, all that he did bears the impress of a profound worker who left nothing neglected that might contribute its light to the discovery of the truth. For that reason these memorials of his life will always repay reading even by the most advanced specialist.

The matter collected in the first volume of the *Kleine Schriften* deals with certain aspects of those grammatical studies which have always proved attractive to American philologists. Prof. Crusius tells us that the publication of the second and concluding volume must depend upon the reception accorded to this. Will not American scholars support the devotion of Ahrens' pupil and the enterprise of the publisher in an undertaking which at best cannot prove highly remunerative, that they and others may possess a collection of essays dealing with the broader aspects of classical culture?

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

Livy. Books I and II. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by J. B. GREENOUGH. Boston and London, Ginn & Co., 1891.

Mr. Greenough's latest contribution to classical scholarship gives abundant evidence that its author has performed no perfunctory task, but has had before him certain definite ideals. The leading feature of the book is the endeavor to assist the student in grasping Livy's thoughts in the form and order in which the historian himself presents them. Great pains are taken to indicate the proper 'thought-perspective' of a complex idea, that the student may clearly discern what is emphatic and what is subordinate in the Latin sentence. The editor has on many previous occasions effectively urged this principle as one of prime importance in the study of Latin. In the present work he has gone further. With admirable skill and judgment he has so analyzed example after example of Livy's thought as to impress clearly upon the reader what it means to read Latin as Latin is written.

Mr. Greenough's own special tastes and studies have naturally led him to emphasize matters of language much more prominently than history or antiquities. In the two latter departments more might well have been given. Even Mommsen is but rarely cited, and there is no reference to the suggestive views of Ihne concerning the character of the early history of Rome. The general impression conveyed by the historical notes is that the whole history, of the regal period at least, is so uncertain that it is useless to undertake to arrive at any rational views concerning it. Even with regard to so well-determined a fact as the right of intermarriage between the inhabitants of different states, Mr. Greenough has no more positive declaration to make than that "*it seems* to have been carefully guarded among the ancients" (p. 30).

In the grammatical notes, as a rule, no statement is made of the principle involved, but a simple reference to the grammar is given. It is questionable whether this method is a wise one to follow. Wherever the grammatical